

ON TSIRELSON'S THEOREM ABOUT TRIPLE POINTS FOR HARMONIC MEASURE

XAVIER TOLSA AND ALEXANDER VOLBERG

ABSTRACT. A theorem of Tsirelson from 1997 asserts that given three disjoint domains in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, the set of triple points belonging to the intersection of the three boundaries where the three corresponding harmonic measures are mutually absolutely continuous has null harmonic measure. The original proof by Tsirelson is based on the fine analysis of filtrations for Brownian and Walsh-Brownian motions and can not be translated into potential theory arguments. In the present paper we give a purely analytical proof of the same result.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a paper from 1997 Tsirelson [Ts] proved the following result, previously conjectured by Bishop in [Bi] (see also Problem **a** in [EFS2]):

Theorem 1.1. [Ts] *Let $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be disjoint open connected sets, with harmonic measures $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$. Let $E \subset \partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_2 \cap \partial\Omega_3$ so that $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ are mutually absolutely continuous in E . Then $\omega_i(E) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

We remark that the planar case $n = 1$ of the preceding theorem had previously been proved by Bishop [Bi] and Eremenko, Fuglede, and Sodin [EFS1]. In the higher dimensional case, another previous partial result had been obtained by Bishop in [Bi]. Namely he had shown that if $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_m \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ are disjoint domains with harmonic measures $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m$ which are mutually absolutely continuous in $E \subset \bigcap_{j=1}^m \partial\Omega_j$, then $\omega_j(E) = 0$ if $m = 5$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, or if $m = 11$ in any dimension.

The original proof of Theorem 1.1 by Tsirelson in [Ts] is mostly based on the fine analysis of filtrations for Brownian and Walsh-Brownian motions, and so this proof can not be directly translated into a potential theory proof. In [Ts] Tsirelson asked if the same result can be achieved by non-stochastic arguments. In the present note we give a quite short proof of this theorem by using purely analytical arguments.

It is also worth pointing out that the original formulation of Tsirelson's theorem in [Ts] is somewhat different from the one above. Indeed, denote by $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_3$ the greatest measure μ such that $\mu \leq \omega_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. It is shown in [Ts] that if $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ are disjoint open connected sets with harmonic measures $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$, then $\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_3 = 0$. It is immediate to check that that this statement is equivalent to the one in Theorem 1.1. In fact, assume that Theorem 1.1 holds and let $\mu = \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_3$. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem there are non-negative functions g_i such that $\mu = g_i \omega_i$. Letting $E_i = \text{supp } \omega_i \cap \{g_i > 0\}$, it follows that

$$\mu = \mu|_{E_i} \approx \omega_i|_{E_i} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3,$$

X.T. was supported by the ERC grant 320501 of the European Research Council (FP7/2007-2013), and also partially supported by 2014-SGR-75 (Catalonia), MTM2013-44304-P (Spain), and by the Marie Curie ITN MAnET (FP7-607647). A.V. was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-160065.

where “ $\approx$ ” denotes mutual absolute continuity. It follows then that

$$\mu = \mu|_{E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3} \approx \omega_i|_{E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Now, by Theorem 1.1 the mutual absolute continuity of ω_1 , ω_2 and ω_3 in $E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3$ implies that $\omega_i(E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3) = 0$ and thus $\mu \equiv 0$. The converse implication follows by analogous arguments.

Tsirelson’s theorem is connected to a recent result by Azzam, Mouroglou and the first author of this paper. To state this, we need to introduce the capacity density condition (CDC). A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $n \geq 2$, satisfies the CDC if there is $R_\Omega > 0$ and $c_\Omega > 0$ so that $\text{Cap}(B \setminus \Omega) \geq c_\Omega r(B)^{n-1}$ for any ball B centered on $\partial\Omega$ of radius $r(B) \in (0, R_\Omega)$, where Cap stands for the Newtonian capacity.

Theorem 1.2. [AMT] *For $n \geq 2$, let $\Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be open and let $\Omega_2 = (\overline{\Omega_1})^c$. Assume that Ω_1, Ω_2 are both connected and satisfy the capacity density condition and $\partial\Omega_1 = \partial\Omega_2$. Let ω_1, ω_2 be the respective harmonic measures of Ω_1, Ω_2 . Let $E \subset \partial\Omega_1$ be a Borel set and let T the set of tangent points for $\partial\Omega_1$. Then $\omega_1 \perp \omega_2$ on E if and only if $\mathcal{H}^n(E \cap T) = 0$. Further, if $\omega_1 \ll \omega_2 \ll \omega_1$ on E , then E contains an n -rectifiable subset F upon which ω_1 and ω_2 are mutually absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^n$.*

It would be natural to think that perhaps Tsirelson’s theorem may be derived as a corollary of Theorem 1.2 in the case $n \geq 2$. As far as we know, this is not the case. The main reason is that the latter theorem requires the CDC. In fact, this assumption, which is not present in Theorem 1.1, seems to be an essential condition for the blowup techniques¹ used in [AMT]. So our arguments below to prove Theorem 1.1 are independent of the ones in [AMT]. On the other hand, to tell the truth, we will also use a blowup argument to prove Tsirelson’s theorem, which has some similarities (and also some big differences) with other previous blowup arguments, such as the ones by Kenig, Preiss, and Toro in [KPT], or the ones in [AMT]. See the next section for more details in this direction.

Acknowledgement: We are grateful to Misha Sodin for calling our attention to Tsirelson’s theorem and the lack of an analytic proof of this in a conference in Bedlewo (Poland) in August 2016.

2. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

As usual in harmonic analysis, we denote by C or c constants which usually only depend on the dimension n and other fixed parameters, and which may change their values at different occurrences. For $a, b \geq 0$, we will write $a \lesssim b$ if there is $C > 0$ so that $a \leq Cb$ and $a \lesssim_t b$ if the constant C depends on the parameter t . We write $a \approx b$ to mean $a \lesssim b \lesssim a$ and define $a \approx_t b$ similarly.

In this paper we assume that the harmonic measure any domain of is constructed by Perron’s method.

We will prove Tsirelson’s theorem by applying a blowup argument, as in other previous works such as [KPT] or [AMT]. As far as we know, the introduction of blowup arguments

¹Actually, after the present paper was finished, in a joint of the authors with Azzam and Mouroglou [AMTV] it was shown that Theorem 1.2 also holds without the CDC condition. The main novelty with respect to the arguments in [AMT] is the use of a blowup argument which is precisely inspired by the techniques in the current paper.

(also called renormalisation arguments) in the study of harmonic measure is basically due to Kenig and Toro (see [KT]). These techniques are frequent in other fields such as calculus of variations, sometimes in combination with monotonicity formulas. See [CS] for a standard reference in this area. The arguments in [KPT] assume that the domains involved are non-tangentially accessible (NTA), while in [AMT] the domains satisfy the CDC. In both cases these assumptions imply that the associated Green functions are Hölder continuous, which is an essential ingredient in the blowup arguments of both works.

So a first idea when trying to implement a blowup argument to prove Theorem 1.1 might consist in showing that at least two of the Green functions of the domains Ω_1 , Ω_2 , and Ω_3 are Hölder continuous. To this end, let E be as in Theorem 1.1 and let $x \in E$. It is clear that for each radius $r > 0$ there exists at least two indices $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega_i^c \cap B(x, r)) \gtrsim r^{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega_j^c \cap B(x, r)) \gtrsim r^{n+1}.$$

Here $\mathcal{H}^{n+1}$ stands for the $(n+1)$ -Hausdorff measure. So given r_0 and $k_0 \geq 1$, it follows that there are two indices $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega_i^c \cap B(x, 2^{-k}r)) \gtrsim (2^{-k}r)^{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega_j^c \cap B(x, 2^{-k}r)) \gtrsim (2^{-k}r)^{n+1}$$

for at least $k_0/3$ integers $k \in [1, k_0]$.

From the preceding discussion, by standard arguments analogous to the ones when the CDC holds (arguing as in Lemma 4.5 of [AMT], say), we get that for each $x \in E$ and $0 < r \leq r_0$, there are at least two indices $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ such that

$$G_i(p_i, y) \leq C \sup_{z \in B(x, Cr_0)} G_i(p_i, z) \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{for } y \in B(x, r),$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, and the same replacing i by j . Here $G_h(p_h, \cdot)$ stands for the Green function of Ω_h with pole $p_h \in \Omega_h$, which we assume to be deep inside Ω_h . Note that the precise indices i, j above depend on the particular point x , and more important, also on r . As far as we know, from the preceding estimate we cannot infer that for each point $x \in E$ there are two indices $h = i, j$ (or even one index h) such that $G_h(p_h, \cdot)$ is Hölder continuous at x . In fact, by compactness it seems that at most we will get two indices i, j and a sequence of radii $r_k \rightarrow 0$ (depending on x) so that

$$(2.1) \quad G_h(p_h, y) \leq C \sup_{z \in B(x, Cr_0)} G_h(p_h, z) \left(\frac{r_k}{r_0} \right)^\alpha \quad \text{for } y \in B(x, r_k).$$

Unfortunately, this condition is much weaker than Hölder continuity at x for $G_i(p_i, \cdot)$ and $G_j(p_j, \cdot)$.

We have not been able to use the condition (2.1) to extend the arguments in [KPT] or [AMT] to our particular context. Instead, our arguments will rely on the strong convergence in L^2 of suitable sequences of Green functions, which can be derived by applying the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem in combination with Caccioppoli's inequality, for example.

3. PROOF OF TSIRELSON'S THEOREM

3.1. Preliminary lemmas. We will need the following classical result. See for example [AHM³TV, Lemma 3.3] for the detailed proof.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a bounded domain. Denote by ω^p its harmonic measure with pole at p and by G its Green function. Let $B = B(x_0, r)$ be a closed ball with $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 < r < \text{diam}(\partial\Omega)$. Then, for all $a > 0$,*

$$(3.1) \quad \omega^x(aB) \gtrsim \inf_{z \in 2B \cap \Omega} \omega^z(aB) r^{n-1} G(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \setminus 2B \text{ and } y \in B \cap \Omega,$$

with the implicit constant independent of a .

In the preceding statement, aB stands for the ball concentric with B with radius equal to a times the radius of B .

The next lemma is usually known as Bourgain's estimate. See [Bo] (or [AHM³TV, Lemma 3.4] for the precise formulation below).

Lemma 3.2. *There is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending only on $n \geq 1$ so that the following holds for $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a bounded domain, $n - 1 < s \leq n + 1$, $\xi \in \partial\Omega$, $r > 0$, and $B = B(\xi, r)$. Then*

$$\omega^x(B) \gtrsim_{n,s} \frac{\mathcal{H}_\infty^s(\partial\Omega \cap \delta B)}{(\delta r)^s} \quad \text{for all } x \in \delta B \cap \Omega.$$

Let $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$. Suppose that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r) \cap \Omega_3) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r) \cap \Omega_i).$$

Then

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r) \cap \Omega_1) + \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r) \cap \Omega_2) \leq \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r)).$$

From Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 we deduce that if (3.2) holds for $\xi \in E$ and $r > 0$, then, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$(3.4) \quad \omega_i^x(B(\xi, \delta_0^{-1}r)) \gtrsim r^{n-1} G_i(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_i \setminus B(\xi, 2r) \text{ and all } y \in B(\xi, r) \cap \Omega.$$

The next lemma follows by standard arguments. For completeness, we will give full details.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $a > 1$. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ and E be as in Theorem 1.1. There exists $b = b(a) > 1$ such that for ω_i -a.e. $\xi \in E$ there exists a sequence of ω^j -(a, b)-doubling balls $B(\xi, r_k)$ simultaneously for $j = 1, 2, 3$, with $r_k \rightarrow 0$. That is,*

$$\omega_j(B(\xi, ar_k)) \leq b \omega_j(B(\xi, r_k)) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and for all } k \geq 1.$$

Proof. It is well known that, given any Radon measure μ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, if we choose $b > a^{n+1} > 1$, then for μ -a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ there exists a sequence of μ -(a, b)-doubling balls $B(\xi, r_k)$, with $r_k \rightarrow 0$. See for example Chapter 2 of [To]. Applying this to ω_1 , we infer that for ω_1 -a.e. $\xi \in E$ there exists a sequence of ω_1 -(a, b)-doubling balls $B(\xi, r_k)$ with $r_k \rightarrow 0$.

We claim now for ω_1 -a.e. $\xi \in E$ and $j = 2, 3$,

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega_1(B(\xi, ar))}{\omega_1(B(\xi, r))} \frac{\omega_j(B(\xi, r))}{\omega_j(B(\xi, ar))} = 1.$$

To check this, note that by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, taking also into account the mutual absolute continuity of ω_j with ω_1 in E ,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega_1(B(\xi, ar))}{\omega_1(B(\xi, r))} \frac{\omega_j(B(\xi, r))}{\omega_j(B(\xi, ar))} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega_1(B(\xi, ar) \cap E)}{\omega_1(B(\xi, r) \cap E)} \frac{\omega_j(B(\xi, r) \cap E)}{\omega_j(B(\xi, ar) \cap E)} \quad \text{for } \omega_1\text{-a.e. } \xi \in E.$$

Let $h_{j,1}$ be the density functions such that

$$\omega_j|_E = h_{j,1} \omega_1|_E,$$

so that $h_{j,1} \in L^1(\omega_1|_E)$ and $0 < h_{j,1} < \infty$ ω_1 -a.e. By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem again, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega_1(B(\xi, ar) \cap E)}{\omega_j(B(\xi, ar) \cap E)} = \frac{1}{h_{j,1}(\xi)} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega_j(B(\xi, r) \cap E)}{\omega_1(B(\xi, r) \cap E)} = h_{j,1}(\xi)$$

for a.e. $\xi \in E$, and thus our claim (3.5) holds.

Now we deduce that if $\xi \in E$ is a point such that (3.5) holds and $B(\xi, r_k)$ is a sequence of ω_1 -(a, b)-doubling balls with $r_k \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_j(B(\xi, ar_k))}{\omega_j(B(\xi, r_k))} = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_1(B(\xi, ar_k))}{\omega_1(B(\xi, r_k))} \leq b,$$

which proves the lemma. $\square$

3.2. Proof of the theorem. We will give now the detailed arguments for the case $n \geq 2$, and later we will sketch the required changes for the planar case $n = 1$.

By standard arguments we may assume the domains Ω_i to be bounded. We fix poles $p_i \in \Omega_i$ for the harmonic measures ω_i , with p_i deep inside Ω_i , and for simplicity we write $\omega_i = \omega_i^{p_i}$. We denote by $h_{i,j}$ the density function of ω_i with respect to ω_j on E . That is,

$$\omega_i|_E = h_{i,j} \omega_j|_E.$$

Let $\xi \in E$ be a Lebesgue point for χ_E and for all the density functions $h_{i,j}$ and so that there exists a decreasing sequence of radii $r_k \rightarrow 0$ satisfying the property described in Lemma 3.3, for some constant $a > 2$ big enough to be chosen below. We may assume that there exists an infinite subsequence of radii such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r_k) \cap \Omega_3) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(B(\xi, r_k) \cap \Omega_i).$$

By renaming the subsequence $\{r_k\}_k$ if necessary, we assume that this holds for all $k \geq 1$.

Denote $\mathbb{B} = B(0, 1)$ and consider the affine map $T_k(x) = (x - \xi)/r_k$, so that $T_k(B(\xi, r_k)) = \mathbb{B}$. For $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $k \geq 1$ take the measures

$$\omega_i^k = \frac{1}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} T_k \# \omega_i.$$

Notice that

$$1 = \omega_i^k(\mathbb{B}) \leq \omega_i^k(a\mathbb{B}) = \frac{\omega_i(B(\xi, ar_k))}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} \leq b,$$

where $a\mathbb{B} = B(0, a)$. Hence there is a subsequence of radii r_k so that $\omega_i^k \rightarrow \omega_i^\infty$ weakly in $\frac{a}{2}\mathbb{B}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, for some Borel measure ω_i^∞ such that

$$1 \leq \omega_i^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{B}}) \leq \omega_i^\infty(\frac{a}{2}\mathbb{B}) \leq b$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and all $k \geq 1$.

For $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $k \geq 1$ consider now the functions

$$(3.6) \quad u_i^k(x) = \frac{r_k^{n-1}}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} G_i(p_i, T_k^{-1}(x)),$$

so that, for any C^∞ compactly supported function φ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.7) \quad \int \varphi d\omega_i^k &= \frac{1}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} \int \varphi \circ T_k d\omega_i = \frac{1}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} \int \Delta(\varphi \circ T_k) G_i(p_i, x) dx \\
 &= \frac{1}{r_k^2 \omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} \int \Delta\varphi(T_k x) G_i(p_i, x) dx = \frac{r_k^{n-1}}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} \int \Delta\varphi(y) G_i(p_i, T_k^{-1}y) dy \\
 &= \int \Delta\varphi u_i^k dy.
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice also that u_i^k is a non-negative function which is harmonic in $a\mathbb{B} \cap T_k(\Omega_i)$. Further, for $i = 1, 2$, by (3.4), assuming r_k small enough and choosing $a > \delta_0^{-1}$, for all $x \in \delta_0 a\mathbb{B} \cap T_k(\Omega_i)$,

$$(3.8) \quad u_i^k(x) \leq C(b).$$

We suppose that all the points in the open sets Ω_i are Wiener regular for the Dirichlet problem (otherwise we may apply an approximation argument analogous the one in [HMMTV]. See the end of this section for more details). Then the functions u_i^k extend continuously by zero in $a\mathbb{B} \setminus T_k(\Omega_i)$. We continue to denote by u_i^k such extensions, which are subharmonic in $a\mathbb{B}$. By Caccioppoli's inequality and the uniform boundedness of u_i^k in $\delta_0 a\mathbb{B}$ we deduce that, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\|\nabla u_i^k\|_{L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})} \lesssim \|u_i^k\|_{L^2(\frac{1}{2}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})} \lesssim_b 1.$$

See (3.7) of [KPT] for a similar argument. By the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, the unit ball of the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$ is relatively compact in $L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$, and thus there exists a subsequence of the functions u_i^k which converges *strongly* in $L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$ to another function $u_i \in L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$. Passing to a subsequence, we assume that the whole sequence of functions u_i^k converges in $L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$ to $u_i \in L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$. In particular, from (3.7), passing to the limit it follows that

$$(3.9) \quad \int \varphi d\omega_i^\infty = \int \Delta\varphi u_i dx,$$

for any C^∞ function φ compactly supported in $\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B}$.

Consider the function

$$u(x) = u_1(x) - u_2(x).$$

Note that, by (3.9),

$$\int \Delta\varphi u dx = \int \Delta\varphi u_1 dx - \int \Delta\varphi u_2 dx = \int \varphi d\omega_1^\infty - \int \varphi d\omega_2^\infty.$$

We claim that

$$(3.10) \quad \omega_1^\infty = \omega_2^\infty \quad \text{in } \frac{1}{2}a\mathbb{B}.$$

We defer the detailed (and standard) arguments to the end of the proof. Assuming (3.10) for the moment, we deduce that $\Delta u = 0$ in $\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B}$ in the sense of distributions, and hence also in the classical sense (because $u \in L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$).

Let us check that u does not vanish identically in $\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B}$. Since the domains Ω_1 and Ω_2 are disjoint, it follows that

$$\|u_1^k - u_2^k\|_{L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})} \geq \|u_1^k\|_{L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})} \gtrsim \|u_1^k\|_{L^1(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})},$$

which is bounded from below by (3.9). To see this, just take a bump function φ identically 1 on $\overline{\mathbb{B}}$ and supported on $2\mathbb{B} \subset \frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B}$ (assume $a \geq 4\delta_0^{-1}$). Hence, by the convergence of $u_1^k - u_2^k$ in $L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})$ we also deduce that

$$\|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B})} \neq 0.$$

Next we intend to get a contradiction by showing that u vanishes in a set of positive Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{B} \subset \frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a\mathbb{B}$, which is impossible because the zero set of any harmonic function is a real analytic variety.

Recall that, by (3.3), there exists a set $F_k \subset B(\xi, r_k) \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$ such that $\mathcal{H}^{n+1}(F_k) \gtrsim r_k^{n+1}$. Hence, denoting $G_k = T_k(F_k)$, we infer that

$$\int_{G_k} |u_1^k - u_2^k| dx = 0.$$

We may assume that χ_{G_k} converges weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{B})$ to some non-negative function $g \in L^2(\mathbb{B})$. Clearly, $\|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{B})} \lesssim 1$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}} g dx = \langle \chi_{\mathbb{B}}, g \rangle = \lim_k \langle \chi_{\mathbb{B}}, \chi_{G_k} \rangle \gtrsim 1.$$

Also, by the strong convergence of $|u_1^k - u_2^k|$ and the weak convergence of χ_{G_k} ,

$$\int |u_1 - u_2| g dx = \lim_k \int |u_1^k - u_2^k| \chi_{G_k} dx = 0,$$

which implies that $u_1 - u_2$ vanishes on a set of positive Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{B}$ and provides the aforementioned contradiction.

It remains now to prove that $\omega_1^\infty = \omega_2^\infty$ in $\frac{1}{2}a\mathbb{B}$. To this end, consider a continuous function φ compactly supported in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{B}$. Denote $\varphi_k = \varphi \circ T_k$. For $i = 1, 2$ and all k we write

$$\begin{aligned} \int \varphi d\omega_i^k &= \frac{1}{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int \varphi_k d\omega_i \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k d\omega_i + \frac{1}{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{B(\xi, ar_k) \setminus E} \varphi_k d\omega_i =: A_i^k + B_i^k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|B_i^k| \leq \|\varphi_k\|_\infty \frac{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, ar_k) \setminus E)}{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, ar_k))} \frac{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, ar_k))}{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \leq b \|\varphi_k\|_\infty \frac{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, ar_k) \setminus E)}{\omega_i^k(B(\xi, ar_k))} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence to prove (3.10) it suffices to show that

$$(3.11) \quad \lim_k \frac{1}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k d\omega_1 = \lim_k \frac{1}{\omega_2^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k d\omega_2.$$

To this end, we set

$$\frac{1}{\omega_2^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k d\omega_2 = \frac{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))}{\omega_2^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \cdot \frac{1}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k h_{2,1} d\omega_1.$$

Since

$$\frac{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))}{\omega_2^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \rightarrow \frac{1}{h_{2,1}(\xi)},$$

we just have to check that

$$h_{2,1}(\xi) \lim_k \frac{1}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k d\omega_1 = \lim_k \frac{1}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k h_{2,1} d\omega_1.$$

This identity follows from the fact that ξ is a Lebesgue point for $h_{2,1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{h_{2,1}(\xi)}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k d\omega_1 - \frac{1}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{E \cap B(\xi, ar_k)} \varphi_k h_{2,1} d\omega_1 \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, r_k))} \int_{B(\xi, ar_k)} |\varphi_k(x)| |h_{2,1}(\xi) - h_{2,1}(x)| d\omega_2(x) \\ & \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \frac{b}{\omega_1^k(B(\xi, ar_k))} \int_{B(\xi, ar_k)} |h_{2,1}(\xi) - h_{2,1}(x)| d\omega_2(x) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. □

3.3. The case when Ω_i is not Wiener regular for some $i = 1, 2, 3$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, for each $i = 1, 2, 3$ there exists a closed set F_i such that $\text{Cap}(F_i) < \varepsilon$ and so that $\tilde{\Omega}_i = \Omega_i \setminus F_i$ is Wiener regular (recall that Cap stands for the Newtonian capacity). For the detailed arguments the reader may consult Section 4 of [HMMTV] (although we suspect that this result was known long before). Then, by the maximum principle (see Section 4 of [HMMTV] for the precise justification), for any set $G \subset \partial\Omega_i \setminus F_i$, denoting by $\tilde{\omega}_i$ the harmonic measure of $\tilde{\Omega}_i$ with respect to $p_i \in \Omega_i \cap \tilde{\Omega}_i$,

$$\tilde{\omega}_i(G) \leq \omega_i(G),$$

and, in particular,

$$\tilde{\omega}_i|_{\partial\Omega \setminus F_i} \ll \omega_i|_{\partial\Omega \setminus F_i}.$$

One then easily deduces that, if ε is chosen small enough, then there exists $\tilde{E} \subset E$ such that $\tilde{\omega}_i \approx \omega_i$ on $\tilde{E}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_i(\tilde{E}) > 0$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$ (we leave the details for the reader). So we can apply the arguments above to the open sets $\tilde{\Omega}_i$ and to $\tilde{E}$ to derive a contradiction.

3.4. The planar case $n = 1$. We recall that in this case there are already purely analytic proofs by Bishop [Bi] and Eremenko, Fuglede and Sodin [EFS1]. Because of this reason, we will only sketch the required changes to adapt the proof of Subsection 3.2 to the planar case.

The main reason why the arguments have to be modified is that Lemma 3.1 does not hold for $n = 1$, as far as we know. As shown in [AHM³TV, Subsection 4.4, close to (4.18)], a reasonable substitute of this lemma is provided by the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} (3.12) \quad |G(y, p) - G(z, p)| & \lesssim \frac{\omega^p(B(x_0, 2\delta^{-1}r))}{\inf_{z \in B(x, 2r) \cap \Omega} \omega^z(B(x, 2\delta^{-1}r))} \\ & + \int_{B(x_0, 3r)} \left(\left| \log \frac{r}{|y - \zeta|} \right| + \left| \log \frac{r}{|z - \zeta|} \right| \right) d\omega^p(\zeta), \end{aligned}$$

valid for $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $0 < r < \text{diam}(\partial\Omega)$, $y, z \in B(x_0, r)$, and p far away in Ω .

Instead of defining the functions u_i^k as in (3.6), we set

$$u_i^k(x) = \frac{r_k^{n-1}}{\omega_i(B(\xi, r_k))} (G_i(p_i, T_k^{-1}(x)) - G_i(p_i, z_i^k)),$$

where z_i^k is some fix point in $B(\xi, r_k) \cap \Omega_i$. Then, using (3.12), choosing appropriately z_i^k , and applying Fubini, one can check that

$$(3.13) \quad \|u_i\|_{L^2(\delta_0 a \mathbb{B})} \lesssim 1,$$

which replaces (3.8), that is no longer valid. On the other hand, as in (3.7), in this situation we also have

$$\int \varphi d\omega_i^k = \int \Delta \varphi u_i^k dy.$$

Because of Caccioppoli's inequality, (3.13), and the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, we still have that u_i^k converges strongly in $L^2(\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a \mathbb{B})$ to some function u_i for $i = 1, 2$. Then we also set

$$u = u_1 - u_2,$$

which turns out to be harmonic, by the same arguments as in the case $n \geq 2$. Also, by analogous arguments to the ones of that case, one can check that u is not identically constant in $\frac{1}{4}\delta_0 a \mathbb{B}$, and then one gets a contradiction by showing that u is constant in a subset of positive Lebesgue measure, which is not possible because u is harmonic.

REFERENCES

- [AHM³TV] J. Azzam, S. Hofmann, J.M. Martell, S. Mayboroda, M. Mourgoglou, X. Tolsa, and A. Volberg. *Rectifiability of harmonic measure*. Geom. Funct. Anal. (GAFA), 26(3) (2016), 703–728.
- [AMT] J. Azzam, M. Mourgoglou and X. Tolsa. *Mutual absolute continuity of interior and exterior harmonic measure implies rectifiability*. Preprint (2015). To appear in Comm. Pure Appl. Math.
- [AMTV] J. Azzam, M. Mourgoglou, X. Tolsa, and A. Volberg. *On a two-phase problem for harmonic measure in general domains*. Preprint arXiv:1608.04022 (2016).
- [Bi] C. J. Bishop. *A characterization of Poissonian domains*. Ark. Mat. 29 (1991), no. 1, 1–24.
- [Bo] J. Bourgain. *On the Hausdorff dimension of harmonic measure in higher dimension*. Invent. Math. 87 (1987), no. 3, 477–483.
- [CS] L. Caffarelli and S. Salsa. *A geometric approach to free boundary problems*. Graduate Texts in Math. 64. Amr. Math. Soc. (2005).
- [EFS1] A. Eremenko, B. Fuglede and M. Sodin. *On the Riesz charge of the lower envelope of δ -subharmonic functions*. Potential Analysis 1 (1992), 191–204.
- [EFS2] A. Eremenko, B. Fuglede and M. Sodin. *Harmonic measure for three disjoint domains in R^n* , in Linear and Complex Analysis Problem Book 3 (V.P. Havin, N.K. Nikolski, eds.) (1994), 323–325.
- [HMMTV] S. Hofmann, J.M. Martell, S. Mayboroda, X. Tolsa and A. Volberg. *Absolute continuity between the surface measure and harmonic measure implies rectifiability*. Preprint 2015. arXiv:1507.04409.
- [KPT] C. Kenig, D. Preiss, T. Toro. *Boundary structure and size in terms of interior and exterior harmonic measure in higher dimensions*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 22 (2009), no. 3, 771–796.
- [KT] C. Kenig and T. Toro. *Free boundary regularity for harmonic measures and Poisson kernels*, Ann. of Math. 150 (1999) 369–454.
- [To] X. Tolsa. *Analytic capacity, the Cauchy transform, and non-homogeneous Calderón-Zygmund theory*. Volume 307 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2014.
- [Ts] B. Tsirelson. *Triple points: from non-Brownian filtrations to harmonic measures*. Geom. Funct. Anal. (GAFA), Vol. 7 (1997) 1096–1142.

XAVIER TOLSA, ICREA, PASSEIG LLUÍS COMPANYYS 23 08010 BARCELONA, CATALONIA, AND, DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES AND BGSMath, UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA, EDIFICI C FACULTAT DE CIÈNCIES, 08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), CATALONIA

E-mail address: `xtolsa@mat.uab.cat`

ALEXANDER VOLBERG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MI 48824, USA

E-mail address: `volberg@math.msu.edu`